

CAR STRUCK
AUTOMOBILEThree Jackson, Mich., People
Killed

TWO OTHERS WERE HURT

A House and Some Trees Hid the Elec-
tric Railroad Tracks From Road
and the Driver Did Not
See.

Jackson, Mich., Aug. 3.—A westbound car on the Detroit, Jackson and Chicago electric railroad struck an automobile containing five Jackson residents at Sutton's crossing, about three miles east of here last evening. Mrs. Levi Palmer, Mrs. Emily Pulver and Bernice Oliver were killed, the two last named instantly. R. Adelbert Oliver, a prominent business man of this city, who was driving the car, was probably fatally injured, while Mrs. R. A. Oliver, the fifth passenger, escaped with less serious injuries. Mr. and Mrs. Oliver and Mrs. Palmer were taken aboard the electric car and brought to this city, but Mrs. Palmer died before they were removed to the hospital.

Two par. Electric railroad tracks of the unused Holland line and the Detroit, Jackson and Chicago cross the country road at the point where the accident occurred. A house and some trees hid the approaching car. From the fact that the brakes on the touring car were not set, it is believed that Mr. Oliver, who was driving, did not see the car. Bernice Oliver, one of the killed, was Mr. Oliver's daughter. Mrs. Pulver was Mrs. Oliver's mother and Mrs. Palmer was their guest.

NEW YORK POLICE MADLY
HUNTING FOR RIPPEREast Side Terrorized by Awful Crimes
in Which Women and Girls Have
Been the Victims of
Unknown.

New York, Aug. 3.—The murder of little eight-year-old Katie Tietzschler, who was found dead Thursday, cloaked to death with her own hair ribbon and her body mutilated by the slayer's lust, in a dark cellar on First avenue, has called forth every effort of the whole police department to find the fiend who has been satisfying his murderous appetite in the straining and hacking to pieces of his victims. Unlike the White Chapel "Jack the Ripper," the New York slayer picks out his victims among children as well as women. The killing of the Tietzschler child was the most atrocious in the city's criminal history.

Two men and a woman are being held in custody on the suspicion that they know something of the girl's death. The woman, Anna Messner, was arraigned in the night court and held without bail for the coroner. The woman was taken to police headquarters and was closely questioned by detectives. She admitted that she knew Gaetano Rippolone, the cobbler and his employee, Giuseppe Bonfanti, both of whom are being detained by the police. She said she had been living for several days at the house where the child's body was found. According to an address he made at the Chautauque assembly, "I hesitate to bring up the question of race suicide," he said, "but it is a dismal fact that the increased expense of bringing up children in cities, where the people either choose or are compelled to live, is largely responsible for the decrease in the birth rate."

MAGILL AND WIFE
HELD FOR MURDERTwo Indictments Returned by the Illinois
Grand Jury in the Poisoning
Case.

Clinton, Ill., Aug. 3.—The grand jury which has been investigating the death of Mrs. Pet Magill, the first wife of Fred Magill, who with his second wife is in jail here, having been brought back from California to answer to the charge of having caused the death of Mrs. Pet Magill, yesterday returned one indictment against Magill and one indictment against Mrs. Faye Graham Magill. The indictments were exactly alike, each containing six distinct counts.

The six counts in each indictment are as follows: That Mrs. Pet Magill was murdered; that the administration of strychnine poison; that the murder was done by arsenic; that she was smothered with a quilt; that she was strangled by chloroform; that she committed suicide as the result of a compact with the defendants, and by their defendants, by some means unknown to the grand jury.

Magill and his bride of four weeks were in the court room when the indictments were returned.

RUSSIAN PEASANTS RESTIVE.
They Burn Down Eleven Estates in
Voronezh.

St. Petersburg, Aug. 3.—Serious agrarian disorders have broken out in the government of Voronezh, where the peasants have burned down eleven estates, and are quelling the riots and a punitive expedition has been sent out on the capital, Voronezh.

PRIESTS ATTACK SOLDIERS.

The Italian Anti-Clerical Riots Con-
tinue.

Spezia, Aug. 3.—The anti-clerical feeling which has been running high in this part of Italy as a result of the alleged immoral practices of the Salesian Fathers in their school at Varazze, culminated today in a violent anti-clerical demonstration which brought about a three-cornered fight in this city between the populace, a detachment of carabinieri and a number of the Salesian Fathers. The fathers attacked the carabinieri with stones and attempted to disarm them. The crowd then mixed in and shots were exchanged. Four carabinieri were wounded. One of the manifestants were killed and two were wounded.

Turin, Aug. 3.—The anti-clerical riots which have broken out in northwestern Italy are largely a result of popular excitement following the publication of certain alleged immoral practices of the Salesian fathers at Varazze. This exposure was printed in L'Avvenire. The school has been closed and the pupils sent to their homes. The public prosecutor of the district has arrived at Varazze and is conducting an investigation.

IMPICATES TWO IN
TRAIN ROBBERYPair Arrested Through Unguarded Tip
Given By Man Now in Jail.

Butte, Mont., Aug. 3.—George C. Hastings, another Northern Pacific train robber suspect, was arrested yesterday near Whitehall while attempting to leave the state, and Harry J. Gruber, another enlisted man, will be brought back from Fort Stevens, Or., making three under arrest.

The man Tower in the county jail, unwittingly implicated both Gruber and Hastings, and the authorities are now convinced that there were five men implicated in the plot, but that only two, George Tower and Gruber, attempted to carry it out, and killed Engineer Clow.

FORAKER TO FIGHT ON.

At Sandusky Will Make New State-
ment.

Columbus, O., Aug. 3.—Special from Sandusky, where the members of the Ohio Legislature gather today for their annual session, says that though Senator Foraker, who is there as a guest, is not on the programme for a speech, he will be called upon at the banquet tonight to speak and will take the opportunity to state the reasons again for his opposition to the nomination of Secretary Taft for the presidency. It is said that he will give the cabinet members something to answer in the address which he is to take here on the evening of Aug. 19 under the auspices of the Buckeye Republican club.

THREE KILLED ON
FRENCH WARSHIPGun Exploded During Target Practice;
Five Men Are Among Wounded.

Toulon, France, Aug. 3.—Three men were killed and five others wounded by the explosion of a gun during target practice yesterday on board the French training ship Couronne.

Two of the wounded men sustained dangerous injuries.

BROOKS ON RACE SUICIDE.

Caused, He Thinks By The High Cost of
Living.

Chautauque, N. Y., Aug. 3.—John Graham Brooks, believes the cost of living to be the chief cause of race suicide, according to an address he made at the Chautauque assembly. "I hesitate to bring up the question of race suicide," he said, "but it is a dismal fact that the increased expense of bringing up children in cities, where the people either choose or are compelled to live, is largely responsible for the decrease in the birth rate."

FELL TWENTY-FIVE FEET.

David L'Euyer, of Enosburg Falls
Suffers Injuries.

Enosburg Falls, Aug. 3.—David L'Euyer, of this place, about 1:30 o'clock yesterday afternoon, slipped on a board and fell from the top of the new school building, where he was working, to the ground, twenty-five feet below. His left arm was broken and his head and face were badly cut. Dr. C. A. Pratt was called and dressed the wounds, and the injured man is resting comfortably.

VERMONT CHAMPIONSHIP.

The First Round in the Annual Golf
Tournament.

Manchester, Aug. 3.—The first round at match play in the Vermont state golf championship was completed here yesterday morning on the Elkwanok links. Merrill Waters, the holder of the title, handily won his match with George Morse by 5 up and 4 to play. Former champions A. M. Reed and Paul Waterman are still in the running.

GREAT FIND FOR WORKMEN.

Spanish Gold Coins Worth \$2,000 Are
Uncovered.

Frederickton, N. B., Aug. 3.—Workmen excavating at Maryville, a manufacturing town near this city, have uncovered 102 Spanish gold coins of the eighteenth century. The money is worth \$2,000. None of the residents of Maryville can explain how the coins came to be buried there.

Business Good.

New York, Aug. 3.—Despatches to R. G. Dunn & Co. indicate that business is making satisfactory progress, especially at the interior points where the uncertainty regarding the crops is gradually disappearing.

Boston reports that there is a tone of confidence in wholesale markets and that some retail lines are very busy, but Old Home Week causes some interruption.

CHINESE WAR
IN BOSTONNew York Men Made Raid on
Countrymen

KILLING THREE AT ONCE

Many More Were Hurt in the Encoun-
ter Last Night—Several Arrests
Made on Suspicion of Com-
plicity.

Boston, Aug. 3.—Burning with hatred for their deadly enemies belonging to the rival On Leung Tong society, a band of New York Chinamen numbering a dozen or more, and said to be members of the notorious Hop Sing Tong organization, entered a narrow alley in Chinatown last night and drawing new 44-calibre revolvers, opened fire upon half a hundred of Chinamen, killing three and injuring eleven.

At the sound of the first volley the Chinamen rushed for their quarters, stumbling over one another in their haste to reach shelter behind closed doors. The Hop Sing Tong men chased their victims into their own doorways and shot them down as they rushed up stairs or into side rooms. Then casting away their guns, the strange visitors rushed from the Chinese quarter, most of them escaping the police. The dead are: Wong Su Jung, aged 30, restaurant proprietor; Chin Lat, 35, laundry man; Chin Mon Quin, 48, merchant.

Immediately after the shooting one of the Hop Sing Tong men from New York was captured by a policeman as he was running away. The man gave his name as Nin Sing, aged 29, of New York. He was dressed in American clothes. Later an officer at the South station took into custody Hong Woon, aged 24, of New York, whose hands were powder stained. Both prisoners are charged with manslaughter.

SOUTHERN RAILWAY BARRED.

Its License Has Been Revoked by the
State of Alabama.

Montgomery, Ala., Aug. 3.—The license of the Southern Railway company to do business in Alabama has been revoked, by action of Secretary of State Frank N. Julian, who has caused to be entered upon the state of Alabama, those records of his office, the statement that for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county, in the charge of a locomotive engine, in the case of the Southern railway, for violation of Senate bill No. 86, effective July 1, the Southern railway has been deprived of its right to do business in the state. His action is not in resistance to restraining orders issued by the United States court of the fifth circuit, as this law is not among those enacted by the railroads and not included in any of the litigation now pending in the court of Federal Judge Jones of the middle Alabama district. The case upon which the revocation was made out came from the circuit court of Talladega county,